

APPLICANT(S): SHILOH, Dekel
SERIAL NO.: 09/814,451
FILED: March 22, 2001
DOCKET NO. P-6217-US

Page 6

REMARKS

The present Amendment is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Applicant asserts that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6 have been amended. New claims 8-20 have been added.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the amendments to the claims and newly submitted claims add no new matter to the application.

Voluntary Amendment of Claims

Claims 1-6 have been voluntarily amended to more clearly define the subject matter regarded as the invention and to correct potentially ambiguous language. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to the claims are voluntary and should not result in any prosecution history estoppel. It is further submitted that no new matter has been added to the application.

Remarks to New Claims

New claims 8-20 have been added to further define the scope of the invention. New claims 8-11 are dependent from independent claim 6, as amended. New claims 12-20 recite a system implementing various aspects of the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that the new claims should be allowed for the reasons discussed below. It is further submitted that no new matter has been added to the application.

APPLICANT(S): SHILOH, Dekel
SERIAL NO.: 09/814,451
FILED: March 22, 2001
DOCKET NO. P-6217-US

Page 7

CLAIM REJECTIONS

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as being anticipated by Fortenberry et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,005,939). The Examiner contended that Fortenberry et al. teaches all the elements recited in claims 1-7. The Examiner cited various portions of Fortenberry to support this rejection.

As is well established, in order to assert a prima facie case of anticipation, the Examiner must provide a single prior art document that includes every element and limitation of the claim or claims being rejected.

It is respectfully submitted that Fortenberry et al. does not teach, suggest or imply, at least, using first and second databases, as recited by the method of amended claim 1 and by the system of new claim 12. Specifically, the "passport agent" of Fortenberry et al. does not include a first database, which is not accessible from the communication network, and a second database associated with the communication network, wherein the first database includes both real (first) data and virtual (second) data and the second database includes the virtual (second) data.

The passport agent described in Fortenberry includes a database where profiles of many users are saved. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in Fortenberry of storing information of the same user in two separate databases, the first including real and virtual information, and the second including just the virtual information, as required by amended claim 1 and 12. Upon reading the particular sections of Fortenberry cited by the Examiner, namely, Col. 5 lines 62-67 and Col. 6 lines 1-7, Applicant could not find a teaching of two databases as recited by claim 1 and 12.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 12 are clearly not anticipated by Fortenberry et al. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the structural differences between claims 1 and 12 and Fortenberry et al. are functionally significant in the context of the claimed invention. For example, the two separate databases enable users to interact on the Internet exclusively using their virtual information, where there is no linkage

APPLICANT(S): SHILOH, Dekel
SERIAL NO.: 09/814,451
FILED: March 22, 2001
DOCKET NO. P-6217-US

Page 8

between the virtual entity and the identity of the real entity, not even through deciphering of encrypted data, e.g., by intentional "hacking" or when there is a failure of the security level being used.

The system described in Fortenberry et al. suggests protecting certain data fields by electronic security means but there is no suggestion in Fortenberry et al. of fundamentally separating real and virtual databases as in claimed invention.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 12 are patentable over Fortenberry et al. the cited references and any combination thereof.

As to independent claim 6, first applicant would like to point out that the Examiner incorrectly cited a portion of this claim in the Office Action as reading "...information corresponding to a virtual representation..." (emphasis added) when the claim in fact recited "...information corresponding to a visual representation..." (emphasis added). It is respectfully submitted that this feature alone would have been sufficient to overcome the rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), because Fortenberry et al. does not teach a virtual entity that includes a visual representation.

Claim 6 has been amended to replace the phrase "visual representation" with "one or more physical attribute", which may include a visual representation (e.g., as in dependent claim 9) or other physical attributes of the virtual entity. It is respectfully submitted that there is no such teaching in Fortenberry et al. Furthermore, in view of the above discussion of claims 1 and 12, Fortenberry et al. does not teach or suggest the feature "...wherein said virtual entity is not linkable, on said communication network, to the identity of said real entity", as recited in amended claim 6. Additionally, in view of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that the structural differences between claim 6 and Fortenberry et al. are functionally significant in the context of the claimed invention. For example, the virtual entity as defined in claim 6 enables a user to interact on the Internet exclusively using the virtual entity, where there is danger of compromising the identity of the real entity, even by intentional "hacking" or when there is a failure of electronic security.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 6 is not anticipated nor rendered obvious by Fortenberry et al. and is therefore patentable over this reference.

APPLICANT(S): SHILOH, Dekel
SERIAL NO.: 09/814,451
FILED: March 22, 2001
DOCKET NO. P-6217-US
Page 9

Claims 2-5, 7-11 and 13-20 dependent, directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 6 and 12, respectively, and include all the limitations of those claims as well as additional distinguishing features of the invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-5, 7-11, and 13-20 are all patentable at least for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

The present communication is intended to be fully responsive to all points of rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Prompt and favorable reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims of this application are thus respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Caleb Pollack
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,912

Dated: September 22, 2003

Eitan, Pearl, Latzer & Cohen Zedek, LLP.
10 Rockefeller Plaza, Suite 1001
New York, New York 10020
Tel: (212) 632-3480
Fax: (212) 632-3489